

# **Yugoslav Communism**

## **Yugoslav Communism and the Macedonian Question.**

**Stephen E. Palmer, Jr. Robert R. King**

**ARCHON BOOKS 1971**

### **PREFACE**

This book is the result of research that began some sixteen years ago and has continued intermittently since that time. Consequently, the two of us are indebted to numerous people and institutions widely separated in time and space. The project was begun at Indiana University where Dr. James F. Clarke and Joseph Strmecki provided valuable advice and assistance. Miss Lenore Schwartz assisted in typing the manuscript at this stage of the project.

The manuscript was finished in Cambridge, Massachusetts. Professor William E. Griffith generously made available his materials at the M.L.T. Center for International Studies. The staffs of the Russian Research Center and of the Widener Library, both at Harvard University, were most cooperative in granting access to their extensive collections. Professor Uri Ra'anan read and offered helpful criticism on portions of the manuscript.

We are grateful to Harry Stritman of the Library of Congress for calling an earlier version of the manuscript to the attention of the publisher. Finally, we must particularly thank Peter Krogh, currently Dean of the Foreign Service Institute of Georgetown University, for being the essential link in bringing the two authors together.

We express our deep appreciation to those who have assisted us in this work. For errors in judgment and fact, we alone are responsible.

**Robert R. King Radio Free Europe**

**Stephen E. Palmer, Jr. Madras, India**

### **CHAPTER 9**

#### **THE ENCOURAGEMENT OF MACEDONIAN CULTURE**

The autonomy granted Macedonia in political and economic affairs was severely limited by Belgrade. Thus it has been a limited stimulus to the development of Macedonian nationalism. Any grant of power to Skopje would be at the expense of

Belgrade. However, in the cultural sphere Macedonia was allowed much greater national autonomy as long as certain basic limitations were observed-cultural autonomy must strengthen and not weaken Macedonia's links with the rest of Yugoslavia, it must weaken Bulgarian consciousness of the Macedonians, and it must fit the current requirements of Yugoslav socialist realism. With close regulation of education and cultural affairs by the Federal Executive Council, by the party Central Committee's Commission for Agitation and Propaganda, as well as by the pro-Belgrade party leadership in Macedonia, cultural "Macedonianism" has been kept within these bounds. However, cultural development has given greater impetus to Macedonian nationalism than any other aspect of the Communist program to develop a Macedonian consciousness.

Macedonia's postwar cultural development springs partly from indigenous seeds and partly from the almost frantic party cultivation of Macedonian cultural forms calculated to differentiate the Macedonians from the Bulgarians. During the inter-war period when Belgrade followed a policy of Serbianization, the Macedonians refused to be assimilated. As the Bulgarianophile sentiment began to wane under Bulgarian occupation during World War II, many Macedonians acknowledged cultural differences from the Bulgarians. Hence, when Macedonians were recognized as a separate nationality with a distinct national language in 1943, the desire to develop a Macedonian culture was given the opportunity to express itself.

The stronger impetus to Macedonian culture, however, came from the Yugoslav Communists. They recognized the existence of a Macedonian nationality to quiet fears of the Macedonian population that a communist Yugoslavia would continue to follow the policy of forced Serbianization. At the same time, the modern conception of the national state implies that a nationality should be a part of a state with its co-nationals. Hence, for the

## YUGOSLAV COMMUNISM - MACEDONIAN QUESTION

Yugoslav communists to recognize the inhabitants of Macedonia as Bulgarians would be tantamount to admitting that they should be part of the Bulgarian state. However, by declaring the people to be of the "Macedonian" nationality, the Yugoslav Communists could fully justify keeping the territory in a Yugoslav federation composed of various other Slavic peoples. Cultural "autonomy" was an excellent means to further Yugoslav aims in Macedonia. By using a Macedonian language for newspapers and in schools, opposition to Belgrade was reduced. At the same time, furthering Macedonian culture could be used to root out traces of Bulgarian national consciousness and culture, thus weakening Bulgarian irredentism. The Yugoslav Communists, at first with the approval of the Bulgarian party, went so far as to spread Macedonian culture in Pirin Macedonia. This anti-Bulgarian or de-Bulgarizing aspect of Macedonian culture has been one of the principal forces behind Belgrade's encouragement of culture.

The progress of Macedonian culture has been uneven-at times stimulated by internal pressures, at times forced by Bulgarian irredentism. However, the encouragement and evolution of Macedonian culture has had a far greater and more permanent impact on Macedonian nationalism than has any other aspect of Yugoslav policy. While development of national music, films and the graphic arts has been encouraged in Macedonia, the greatest cultural effect has come from the creation of the Macedonian language and literature, the new Macedonian national

interpretation of history, and the establishment of a Macedonian Orthodox Church.

The Macedonian language is considered by most Macedonians to be one of the most positive contributions to their separate status. The question of what language Macedonians actually spoke prior to 1945 has caused disagreements among even the most disinterested linguists. The Macedonian dialects made a gradual transition from Serbian north of Skopje to Bulgarian in Eastern Macedonia. Even those who claim that a separate Macedonian language existed before 1945 admit that all these dialects have a very close affinity to Bulgarian. The elements of distinction between the central Macedonian group of dialects (Le., the language spoken roughly within the region Prilep-Bitolj-Kicevo-Titov Veles) and western Bulgarian were noticeable but not significant.<sup>2</sup> Bulgarian linguistic influence was strengthened by intense secular and religious propaganda in the past and by the fact that Bulgarian was the language used by the old Macedonian nationalists.

It was natural that the Yugoslav government regarded a distinct Macedonian language as a bulwark against Bulgarian irredentism. At the same time, it was a very real concession to the Macedonians vis-a-vis the Serbs. The First Assembly of the ASNOM in August 1944 passed a resolution declaring Macedonian the republic's official language. A commission was

created to determine which features of the spoken dialects were to be incorporated in the written language, and in May 1945 an alphabet was adopted by law.' .

As the basis for the new literary language the Central Macedonian dialect was chosen. The explanation was that this region was the most populous area and that it was important in Macedonian history. In addition Krste Misirkov, an advocate of the creation of a separate Macedonian language in the early twentieth century, and other Macedonian nationalists used the central dialects.<sup>4</sup> However, this dialect is also the Macedonian dialect most unlike both Serbian and Bulgarian. This was probably a far more important consideration in the government's decision. It has been claimed that, in fact, the north-western Macedonian dialects (those most similar to Serbo-Croatian and most unlike Bulgarian) had been originally chosen as the basis for the new language but had to be abandoned because of popular opposition. <sup>5</sup>

From the very beginning, Macedonian linguists concentrated on showing the Macedonian language to be different from other languages. The first grammar, published in 1946, established nine distinctive traits of the new language and stressed its differences from other Slavic languages.<sup>6</sup> At first the language had many words, especially political, literary, philosophical, and technical terms, which were borrowed from Bulgarian, Serbian and Russian. However, from the beginning an effort was made to purge these foreign elements, particularly those from Bulgarian. The commission which codified the language was guided by the principle: The vocabulary of the literary language should be enriched with terms taken from all Macedonian dialects. New words should be created with living inflections of the folk speech. Borrowed words from other languages should be retained only where necessary. <sup>7</sup>

As a result, Bulgarian, Russian (after 1948) and other foreign words were replaced by words existing in one of the local Macedonian dialects or by terms created by combining native elements.

In addition to making the modern Macedonian., literary language different from Bulgarian., Yugoslav- linguists also have gone to great effort in attempting to show that the old Macedonian dialects were essentially a separate language. The

Macedonian (anti-Bulgarian) interpretation of their linguistic development is not considered by party leaders to be an ivory tower matter; the campaign is carried on through the mass media. Numerous articles on the alleged historical differences, some dating back to the middle ages, are carried by newspapers. In an early pamphlet (1950) on this subject, the party expressed concern over the popular failure to acknowledge the separate existence of a distinct Macedonian language in the past:

#### YUGOSLAV COMMUNISM - MACEDONIAN QUESTION

We are meeting with blind acceptance of Great Bulgarian theories with regard to the struggle of our people for its national language. Study of the struggle for a national language is important, because language is one of the four basic elements without which there cannot be talk of a nation. The broad reading public, and even some teachers of national history, know little about the one hundred year struggle of our people for its own national language, or they underestimate it or misunderstand it, and thus they unconsciously become bearers of an anti-historical, unscientific stand with regard to our language. Some lecturers and publicists of our history are bringing to the masses the conception that the Macedonians started in their schools and in their other cultural institutions with the use of the Bulgarian language as their literary language and that this language was used during the whole 19th and 20th centuries until the thirties, when progressive Macedonian publicists took as their literary language one of the Macedonian dialects. Thus it is made to seem that the Macedonian literary language appeared as a shot out of the dark, because with such a conception the struggle for a national language, which started in the middle of the 19th century, is ignored. 8

This pamphlet then cites several of the historical examples of the use of a Macedonian language, including that "little masterpiece of political agitation," a manifesto made in the name of the ill-fated Krusevo Republic of 1903. The Macedonian Communists do not deny that the language of Goce Delcev and most other national heroes was Bulgarian, or that Bulgarian was the written Macedonian language generally until the Second World War. But Macedonian linguists explain that the Macedonian and Bulgarian peoples were facing essentially the same conditions in their struggle for national liberation against Turkey therefore; they coordinated their efforts. Since the Bulgarian bourgeoisie was more advanced than the Macedonian bourgeoisie, the Bulgarian literary language was further developed; hence, it was used by the Macedonians. The bulk of Macedonian linguistic history is aimed at magnifying the few historical instances of the written use of Macedonian dialects. 9

Much was done from the beginning to secure wide usage of the new language. The first grammar was published in 1946, an orthography in 1951. An 80,000 word dictionary was published in three volumes between 1961 and 1966. Two journals were started to encourage the use of the Macedonian *language-Makedonski jazik* (1950) and *Literaturen zbov* (1954). The new literary language was employed from the very beginning by the mass media of the republic. However, in the early years there were many difficulties in securing wide usage of the still-changing Macedonian language. Writings of the old Macedonian revolutionaries and often even speeches and articles by party leaders had to be translated or adjusted before

## '1 THE ENCOURAGEMENT OF MACEDONIAN CULTURE

being used. The lack of adequate language standards and of experience in using the norms that had evolved resulted in linguistic hodgepodes in composition and speech. The vast majority of the population spoke the Macedonian dialects of their regions and the new Macedonian literary language only gradually penetrated the natural speech habits of a population just beginning to pull itself out of the depths of illiteracy and isolation.

A decade after the war, special institutes had to be held for Macedonian language instructors. Commenting on the use of the new Macedonian in literature in 1952, Lunt wrote:

Many Macedonians have not yet learned to use their native Macedonian on all stylistic levels. . . . It is only the small group of intellectuals daily concerned with the written word who now write easily, without frequent Serbisms or Bulgarisms. . . . The writers were burdened by their education in Serbian or Bulgarian; they had learned in the long hard years of school Macedonian was only for intimate friends and the most familiar ideas and feelings, but in broader spheres Serbian (or Bulgarian) must be used. This means that even today many Macedonians unconsciously slip into Serbian when discussing political, philosophical or artistic matters. 10

The standardization of the new literary language has been a continuing process. But with its constant use in schools, the press, radio, books and theater, Macedonians have gradually come to understand and use the new language. The major non-Macedonian cultural pull, because of party pressure, has been to Serbo-Croatian rather than Bulgarian. Serbo-Croatian is the second language in Macedonian schools. As the output of original Macedonian literary works and even translations of standard Communist works into Macedonian was modest in the beginning, Serbo-Croatian was widely read. In time the supply of Macedonian textbooks, manuals and propaganda pamphlets has improved. Bulgarian books were discouraged before 1948 and prohibited for a time after the Cominform break. 11 Although at times when Bulgarian-Yugoslav relations have been good, Bulgarian works have been available throughout Yugoslavia, their accessibility in Macedonia has always been more limited.

It is not surprising that the output of Macedonian literature has been limited both in quantity and quality. This is natural in view of the relative newness of the Macedonian language, the availability of Serbo-Croatian literature, and the fact that secondary linguistic problems are only now being solved. The early postwar literary efforts were limited primarily to poetry and a few short stories. As the language has become more firmly established and as writers have become accustomed to using it, literary works have in

## YUGOSLAV COMMUNISM - MACEDONIAN QUESTION

creased both in volume and quality. Of those literary figures who have appeared, none can be said to be towering.<sup>12</sup>

It is doubtful if the impact of Macedonian literature as such on the development of nationalism will prove as powerful as the use of the new language in the mass media and increasingly in everyday speech. In addition to the difficulty of developing a separate literature for a group of one million people in the shadow of the well-established Serbian and Croatian literatures, the literary themes called for are not always such as will encourage a "nationalist" literature. Immediately after the war the main themes were the partisan struggle with emphasis on the brotherly struggle of all Yugoslav peoples as a precondition for Macedonian liberation. Although since 1948 there has been a shift away from the sterile black-and-white Soviet style of "socialist realism," *Nova Makedonija* and the Macedonian party leadership have continued to exhort writers to deal with "progressive" subjects. A campaign in the early 1950's opposed literary concentration on folklore and encouraged treatment of universal Marxist motives. Works based on Macedonian national characteristics are frowned upon, but still produced.

Reports on Macedonian acceptance of the language have varied greatly. Some emigres claimed that the efforts to de-Bulgarize the language led to the inclusion of so many foreign elements that almost all Macedonians instinctively reject it. One Serbian specialist in Macedonia in the early 1950's reported that the new Macedonian was used mostly by government employees loyal to Belgrade. However, one British expert on Macedonia held the language to be "immensely popular,"<sup>13</sup> and another expressed uncritical enthusiasm about the "happy" acceptance of it and the other new Macedonian cultural forms.<sup>14</sup> A more realistic assessment comes from a Skopje schoolteacher who emigrated from Yugoslavia:

Among the wide masses of the urban population and the intelligentsia, the Macedonian language is accepted as the most important, and often the only good, aspect of the present day Yugoslavia. The children are learning it in the schools and their parents are very satisfied that this is the case. There are places in the countryside where people were reluctant to send their children to school in the days of old Yugoslavia, but now they do so willingly, for they want their children to learn the Macedonian language. . . . The new literature and poetry in the national language has aroused great interest, for through it is created and formed the new national spirit and language. This new literature, as well as the printing of prewar literature and poetry by Macedonians in the national language, has resulted in much reading.

Having been taught in schools and used extensively throughout the SRM for over twenty-five years, the Macedonian language is accepted by most

Macedonians.

## THE ENCOURAGEMENT OF MACEDONIAN CULTURE

The concern of the Macedonian and Yugoslav Communist leaders whenever the existence of the Macedonian language is questioned reflects their feeling that the language is one of the principal elements of a separate Macedonian national consciousness. In 1958 several Bulgarian statements declared that the Slavic inhabitants of Macedonia spoke Bulgarian, not the "semi-Serbian literary language which is fabricated in Skopje." Lazar Koliševski, defensively answering the Bulgarian claims, denied the "alleged 'Serbianization'" of the Macedonian language but justified the frequent use of Serbian expressions: .

The Macedonian language cannot be isolated from the mutual influence of the languages spoken by the Yugoslav peoples. Our common socio-economic development and socialist practice have created and are creating a number of new general expressions and terms accepted by all Yugoslav peoples. . . . The development of the languages of nations which have appeared late on the stage of history provides numerous examples showing that they are subjected to the influence of more developed languages and richer national cultures of related and neighboring peoples. I \_

Denial of the existence of the Macedonian language is considered so serious a challenge to the Macedonian nationality that Belgrade has not hesitated to condemn the Bulgarians regardless of the state of relations with Sofia. Vigorous and vehement denunciations of Bulgarian academicians have been published by leading Yugoslav newspapers even during periods of good relations with Bulgaria. The Yugoslav leaders thus acknowledge that the wide, if imperfect, usage of the Macedonian language is one of the most vital contributions to Macedonian nationali\_m.

The treatment of Macedonian history has the same primary goal as the creation of the Macedonian language-to de-Bulgarize the Macedonians and create a separate national consciousness. Since Marx claimed to have discovered the immutable laws of history, Communists have considered the "correct" interpretation of history as the foundation of all social science and a key element of nationality. In the Balkans, history is a primary ingredient in the development of national consciousness which possesses a current relevance that extends beyond mere academic interest. Hence, the Yugoslav Communists were most anxious to mold Macedonian history to fit their conception of Macedonian consciousness.

In setting the *tpne* for the new interpretation of history, Communist experts found past Macedonian history to suffer from two defects. First, "bourgeois historians, although they may have certain merits for the elaboration of the material facts of history, suffer from the weakness of their ideal

## YUGOSLAV COMMUNISM - MACEDONIAN QUESTION

istic theoretic basis. "16 Hence, new historical works must be based on a correct Marxist-Leninist interpretation of history. Second, and perhaps more important, Macedonian history had to sever the umbilical cord to Bulgaria. It was advanced as a principle of Macedonian historiography that key aspects of Macedonian culture had origins separate from Bulg<lria, that Macedonian history was distinctively different from Bulgarian history.

Lazar Kolisevski gave the initial clues as to the correct interpretation of Macedonian history in his report to the First Congress of the CPM in 1948. The resolution adopted by the First Congress stressed the importance of ideological conformity and emphasized the use of history to re-educate the Macedonian masses:

Great interest should be created [in history] and there should be a systematic approach, with a materialistic elucidation of the historical past of our people in

general, and special elaboration of the socialist movement in our country. The history of the people's liberation struggle should be particularly elaborated. A struggle should be carried out for systematic studies of our past among the broad masses as well as among party members. This is a necessary condition for the ideological uplift of party cadres and for the education of the masses in the spirit of socialism. 17

Macedonian historians, however, apparently had some difficulty in adjusting to the new guidelines for Macedonian history-particularly in distinguishing Macedonian from Bulgarian history. In an article in *Komunist* in January 1950, Vidoe Smilevski gave a summary of the correct interpretation of Macedonian history. 18 Another article by Kiro Miljovski appeared about the same time but went farther, specifically criticizing Macedonian historians and setting out in more detail the party guidelines for interpreting history. Miljovski was particularly critical of the failure to eliminate Bulgarian influences:

Some of our people fail to understand correctly Kuzman Sapkarov's cultural activity in the struggle for the Macedonian language, and they are suspicious about the national character of our entire early national movement simply because Sapkarov or others in the movement were not clearly, explicitly and to the very end nationally inclined, because some of them felt "now a Macedonian, now a Bulgarian." In the same way, some people fall into uncertainty about the Macedonian character of the national liberation movement in Delcev's time simply because Goce Delcev wrote in Bulgarian, because he did not say definitely that Macedonia is one nation and that Bulgaria is another. 1 <

To avoid future uncertainty, Miljovski listed a number of expressions (most

## THE ENCOURAGEMENT OF MACEDONIAN CULTURE

of them frequently used in Bulgarian historical writing) which were to be banned from Macedonian history.

Although Macedonian historical works began to appear, historians found that research on Macedonia was "complex and difficult" because existing literature" is still permeated with Great. Bulgarian spirit, with omissions, distortions and falsifications of many historical facts." 20 The Scientific Institute for National History of the Macedonian Nation was established "to eliminate the influence" of the Macedonian Scientific Institute in Sofia which during the interwar period "published most of the documentary and propaganda materials about Macedonia." 21 The Institute, which had indeed published a great deal of material on Macedonia (including its periodical *Makedonski pregled*), was the principal scholarly advocate during the interwar period of the thesis that the Macedonian Slavs are Bulgarians.

The question of Bulgarian influence on Macedonian history was the thorniest problem of the new historiography. Obviously it was impossible for the Yugoslav Communists to deny completely the role of Bulgaria in the Macedonian revolutionary movement. One of the early attempts to cope with Bulgarian influence utilized the device of "contradictions." According to this explanation Macedonia's national revival developed as "Macedonian in its inner content and Bulgarian in its outer

forms," although late in the process some Macedonian national forms were used along with the Bulgarian forms. The "contradiction" between content and forms extended throughout the entire historical process of the Macedonian revival; it was because of this conflict that Macedonian forms took shape, and it was through the development of these forms that Macedonia "categorically proved its individual national character." 22

Reconciling progressive Marxist historiography with Macedonian national history has proved to be especially difficult. The Macedonian revolutionaries were generally not socialists and the Balkan socialists did not recognize the Macedonian nationality. To walk such a tightrope required great historical agility and the party was frequently called upon to restore balance for historians who went too far in one direction. A *Nova Makedonija* article for example, counseled historians to avoid errors of the epoch of bourgeois idealization, as there is "no reason for interpreting past events with a romantic pathos." The article explained that in approaching the past, all positive traditions should be included as the inheritance of the proletariat, but conservative tendencies should be rejected. The approach toward historical personalities was criticized as being idealized. For example, although Delcev was a forerunner of Marx in Macedonia, it would be mistaken to call him and others like him real Marxists.<sup>23</sup> In dealing with the Balkan socialist movement, writers had to exercise caution:

#### YUGOSLAV COMMUNISM - MACEDONIAN QUESTION

Our socialists did not have a clear idea of the national belonging of the Macedonian people, nor of the need to establish it as a separate unit, and they adopted the stand that the population in Macedonia was composed of members of the Bulgarian, Serbian, and Greek nations and of the minorities.<sup>24</sup>

Although the socialists were wrong on the Macedonian question, they were socialists-hence, progressive and instrumental in the eventual triumph of socialism in Macedonia. The socialist movement was an approved topic for history, but its treatment required delicate handling.

In order to conform to the standards of Yugoslav Marxist historiography and at the same time degrade Bulgarian influence and affirm the Macedonian nationality, Macedonian historical writing has stressed certain themes. In order to create a continuous record of Macedonia as a nation, there is constant re-analysis and rediscovery of probable and improbable historical fragments. The medieval empire of Samuilo with its capital at Ohrid has been designated as a "Macedonian" empire (despite the fact that the empire was destroyed by Basil II who earned the title "Bulgar-slayer" for his campaigns against Samuilo). The "Slavic" missionaries Cyril and Methodius are treated with greatest respect and emphasis is placed on their Macedonian birthplace (Salonika) and on their use of a "Macedonian" dialect as the first Slavic literary language. Macedonian revolutionary heroes are carefully treated. In addition to appropriating the historical legacies of the key founders of the original IMRO-Goce Delcev, Damian Gruev and Pere Tosev-Macedonian historians play up lesser figures who might have given the slightest indication of "socialist" inclination or who were not openly Bulgarophiles. Thus there is glorification of men like Jane Sandansky, Dimo Hadii-Dimov, Petar Peparsev and Nikola Karev, who, because they

defected from the IMRO or lost out in internecine organizational fights, have long been forgotten by chroniclers of the IMRO. The more recent IMRO leaders - Aleksandrov, Protogerov and Mihailov-are excluded from the ranks of the progressive for having been tools of Sofia. Besides, they are symbols which are too dangerous and too recent to attempt to manipulate. Pre-World War II Macedonian history orients events of the past towards the final successful climax of the liberation struggle during the war. However, it is emphasized that victory was possible only because of the fraternal assistance of the other Yugoslav nationalities under guidance of the Communist party.

Despite the difficulties of dealing with the national history, in the beginning Macedonian writers enjoyed a relatively larger degree of permissive action with regard to the employment of nationalist symbols than historians of the other Yugoslav republics. In Macedonian history, the main concentration is on genuine national heroes like Delcev and on their nationalistic

## **THE ENCOURAGEMENT OF MACEDONIAN CULTURE**

character, regardless of their attitudes toward the Serbs and socialism. The accepted heroes of other Yugoslav national groups are portrayed almost exclusively from the point of view of their progressive, anti-religious or anti-

Hapsburg attitudes. In the case of Croatia and Slovenia, the heroes selected by the Communists are those who favored union with Serbia. However, Belgrade permitted Macedonia to treat the role of the Serbs rather negatively, usually as Serbian imperialism. But, to balance these concessions, Macedonian historians are required to give special emphasis to the role of the CPY in their liberation from Bulgarians and Serbs. The struggle in the twenties and thirties for the correct party line on the nationality question is often stressed. The Party's efforts to liberate the Macedonians from the Bulgarian occupiers are combined in historical treatises with attacks against old Great Serbism.<sup>25</sup>

Although the party had some difficulty in establishing a historiography to suit its political needs, numerous works on Macedonian history were published by the Scientific Institute for the National History of the Macedonian People (since shortened to the Institute for National History). The early institute publications include a large number of document collections and writings of early Macedonian revolutionaries. Though some monographs were published they were usually limited in scope. <sup>26</sup> In addition to publications of scholarly interest frequent historical articles and programs are carried in the newspapers and mass media of the Macedonian republic. In the campaign of inspiring a Macedonian consciousness among the population, the Communist approved interpretation of history was used as one of the primary tools.

The first serious challenge to the new Macedonian historiography came in 1958. Yugoslavia and the Soviet Union, which had re-established close ties after 1955, had a second era of unfriendly relations beginning in Fall 1957 and Spring 1958. As part of the anti-Yugoslav program of the bloc, Bulgaria launched a vigorous campaign to deny the Macedonian language, culture, and nationality and to reassert Bulgarian claims to Macedonia. The Macedonian Communist leadership countered by emphasizing more forcefully the elements of Macedonian culture. Evidencing

concern with Macedonian history, Lazar Kolisevski delivered a long speech on Macedonian history at Titov Veles in November 1958. He explained at the beginning that his purpose in dealing with the Macedonian past was "to contribute to the forming of trends towards a correct, scientific understanding of historical events and their underlying social processes," because "we are still faced with many major tasks in the field of clarification of our national history." 27

The thrust of Kolisevski's treatment of history was two-fold-first,

## YUGOSLAV COMMUNISM - MACEDONIAN QUESTION

to reduce even further the significance of Bulgaria in Macedonian history, and second, to stress positive treatment of Serb-Macedonian relations. Although earlier Macedonian historians had explained Bulgarian influence by means of a contradiction with Macedonian inner forms and Bulgarian external forms, Kolisevski degraded Bulgarian influence even further. He argued

the Macedonian nation did not *emerge* as a result of political manipulations in the twentieth century, but it emerged from the general struggle, *resistance* and awareness of the people, which began early in the 19th century.

Kolisevski went on to explain that from the very beginning of the 19th century Macedonian national consciousness grew independently and distinctively from Bulgarian consciousness. But with the development of Macedonian consciousness, the Bulgarians developed imperialist ambitions towards Macedonia. The last part of his speech was particularly critical of the most recent Bulgarian denial of the Macedonian nationality.

The role of the Serbs in Macedonian history, however, he treated much more favorably than Macedonian historians had been doing up to that time. Though admitting that the Serbian bourgeoisie intended to establish its hegemony over Macedonia, Kolisevski quoted extensively from Serbian diplomatic correspondence to show that some Serbs acknowledged a Macedonian nationality and opposed the negation of Macedonian consciousness by Bulgaria. The Serbian bourgeoisie came to deny the Macedonian nationality, Kolisevski claimed, when they entered into a tacit agreement with the Bulgarian and Greek bourgeoisie that only Serbs, Greeks and Bulgarians lived in Macedonia "with their respective number to depend on the manner in which Macedonia was carved up." He asserted that nations can only be created by powerful forces at work among the people and never by the actions of politicians.

Although Kolisevski's speech placed new emphasis on the anti-Bulgarian aspects and softened the anti-Serbian aspects of Macedonian history, it did not represent a real departure for Macedonian historiography. The same ideological line adopted after the Communist consolidation in Macedonia is still the historical guideline. In recent years the quality and volume of Macedonian historical writing has increased, but the themes and their treatment, although more sophisticated, are much the same as before. The national-liberation struggle, the socialist movement in Yugoslavia and the Balkans, and the Macedonian revolutionary tradition dominate historical works. There is still some reticence to treat Macedonian relations with Yugoslavia and Serbia between the wars, but there is greater emphasis on Serb-Macedonian relations during earlier periods. 28

The goals of the national history are unchanged-to reduce the Bul

## THE ENCOURAGEMENT OF MACEDONIAN CULTURE

garian role in Macedonian history and to stress Macedonian national development at the same time emphasizing the importance of close ties with other Yugoslav peoples. However, Macedonian national history has not developed in a vacuum and external problems have affected its course. Since 1956 Bulgaria has not recognized the Macedonian nationality and her historians have been permitted to reassert Bulgarian historical claims to the Macedonian territory and population. Even in periods when Bulgarian- Yugoslav relations have been very good, academic historical controversies have continued, frequently developing political repercussions. The Macedonian historians have thus been forced to defend their dubious historical claims, with the result that their history has become even more polemical and political. The rising nationalism of the Yugoslav peoples has also had its effect in Macedonia. Although increased nationalism first reappeared as the result of economic problems in the late 1950's, it has since spread throughout Yugoslavia's cultural life. The problem reached the point that Tito denounced "nationalistic manifestations" in the field of history at the Eighth Party Congress. 29 The problem was as much present in Macedonia as the other republics. Crvenkovski, at the Fourth Congress of the LCM, just before the Eighth all-party congress, criticized "the still present phenomenon of national romanticism [i.e., over-glorification] in uncovering our national past." Although acknowledging the difficulties of dealing with Macedonian history, Crvenkovski called on historians to adopt the approach which would "contribute to the national consciousness of our people freeing itself of nationalist deviations [pro-Bulgarian and anti-Serb sentiments], to building respect for everything that is positive and common in the struggle of our neighbors [i.e., Serbs and other Yugoslav peoples] and which is a component part of our own national history." 30

One of the most interesting aspects of Macedonian cultural life was the struggle for the creation of an independent Macedonian Orthodox Church. In the Balkan countries, one's religion is a key element of nationality. The concept that nationality is determined by religion is a remnant of the era of Turkish domination (which in the case of Macedonia goes back less than sixty years). Under Ottoman rule, all subjects of the Sultan who were not of the Muslim ruling class were of the Rayah class. Each religious group of this class was organized into an internally autonomous community called a *millet* which was allowed to maintain its traditional laws and internal administration under direction of its religious leaders. In the Balkans generally, religion is characterized by a sense of loyalty that is meant to be perpetual. Hence, to the Balkan subjects of the Sultan, religion was the key element of ethnic and social identity. 31 The establishment of the Bulgarian Exarchate

## YUGOSLAV COMMUNISM - MACEDONIAN QUESTION

in 1870-which included all of Yugoslav Macedonia-was the first recognition of the Bulgarian nationality and the real beginning of Bulgarian nationalism.

When Vardar Macedonia became part of Serbia and later of Yugoslavia, the Serbian Orthodox Church reached agreement with the Patriarch in Constantinople that the Orthodox churches of Macedonia should be under domination of the Serbian church. The policy followed by the Serbian hierarchy toward the Macedonians complemented the "Serbianizing" policy of the government. Vardar Macedonia was called "South Serbia," its inhabitants were called Serbs, and government and church officials were imported from Old Serbia. It was only natural that one of the first demands of the Macedonians after being acknowledged by the Yugoslav Communists as a distinct nationality was the creation of an independent church.

In October 1943 a meeting of clerics in the western part of Macedonia which was under Partisan control demanded creation of a Macedonian church. After the liberation in March 1945, the first national church convention was held at which the Macedonian clergy took the initiative in petitioning the Serbian Patriarchate for independent ecclesiastical status. Although the Serbian Synod refused the petition, an Initiative Committee for the Establishment of the Macedonian Orthodox Church was created by the convention. The Macedonian church remained by organization and in name a part of the Serbian Orthodox Church, although in practice it enjoyed a measure of autonomy. The Macedonian priests had their own republican clerical association as part of the government-sponsored Federation of the Association of the Orthodox Clergy of Yugoslavia. Significantly, *Vesnik*, the official organ of the Orthodox Federation, was published in both Serbian and Macedonian editions.

The Yugoslav Communist government was at first tempted to authorize the establishment of an independent Macedonian church in order to weaken the Serbian church which was a potential opposition threat. The party openly "considered" the proposal for Macedonian church autonomy.<sup>2</sup> However, by going no further, the Communists were able to elicit some support from the Macedonians who hoped for acceptance, and from the Serb hierarchy, who hoped to be able to prevent it. This threat was employed in 1947 to persuade the Patriarch Gavriilo to return from his self-continued exile in the United States and to declare in favor of the new regime, thereby further

splitting Serbian national opposition to the Communists. The threat was further used to secure Serbian Orthodox cooperation in skirmishes with the recalcitrant Roman Catholics. In addition, the government needed to be on moderately good terms with at least one of the major Yugoslav churches, out of consideration for foreign opinion as well as for the maintenance of

## THE ENCOURAGEMENT OF MACEDONIAN CULTURE

domestic balance. There was also concern among some of the Yugoslav Communists that a Macedonian church would encourage Macedonian nationalism to the point that it might be difficult to regulate effectively. It does not appear that the Macedonian Communists were particularly eager to push the question of church autonomy at that time, although the issue aroused intense interest among the general Macedonian public, as well as among the clergy. The early establishment of a national church, whose leaders would acquire much prestige, could have impaired the somewhat fragile public standing of the local party luminaries.

At the Second Annual Session of the Association of Macedonian Orthodox Clergy in 1951, the delegates, having subscribed over two million dinars to the Second

Public Loan and contributed one hundred thousand dinars to hydroelectric schemes, "suggested that a Macedonian national Orthodox Church should be founded." 33 Some months later, Vikentije, the new Patriarch of the Serbian church following Gavriilo's death, declared that the Holy Synod would examine the problem of the Macedonian Orthodox Church but that there was "no question of any changes to be made in the Church constitution."34 In June 1952, the Serbian Archiepiscopal Synod was given the task of endeavoring "to set normal religious conditions in the People's Republic of Macedonia."35 Late in 1953 a Serbian bishop was sent by the Patriarch to work for the further organizational integration of the Macedonian churches into the Serbian church, but there was such a storm of objections that he was forced to leave. Even those priests in Macedonia who had received their seminary training in Serbia reportedly joined the protest.

At the Congress of the Orthodox Priests Federation in February 1955, a representative of the Initiative Committee for the Establishment of the Macedonian Orthodox Church renewed the demand that the Macedonians "be granted a certain national distinction on the condition that they fully recognize canonical unity and jurisdiction of the Serbian Orthodox Church."36 The resolution of the Congress pronounced the Macedonian demands justified, declaring, "Church organizations in Macedonia should not go under the name 'Serbian.'" 37 The Serbian hierarchy was much more reluctant than the priest's association to grant the demands, and a compromise agreement was not worked out until spring 1957. The Serbian church would permit use of the Macedonian language for church administration and preaching, but Old Church Slavonic was to be used for the Divine Liturgy, church seals were to have "People's Republic of Macedonia" and the name of the diocese in the Macedonian alphabet around the Church coat of arms, and bishops and church officials appointed for Macedonia were to be native Macedonians. 38 The accommodation was worked out with Yugoslav government assistance, despite its claims of non-interference in religious affairs. At a

## **YUGOSLAV COMMUNISM - MACEDONIAN QUESTION**

reception for the Serbian bishops given by the Federal Executive Council a month after the compromise was agreed upon, Patriarch Vikentije thanked the government for its help in church affairs:

I cannot help mentioning and expressing my special gratitude to the Federal Executive Council for the assistance extended in consolidating the Church in the People's Republic of Macedonia.

He concluded with "long live" the Yugoslav state and its President Marshal Tito.39 .

The accommodation proved to be short-lived, however. In May 1958 the Serbian church leaders insisted upon appointing Serbian bishops for the Macedonian dioceses, which aroused considerable resentment in Macedonia. This time the Macedonian party leadership strongly supported the organization of a separate Macedonian church. A national church convention of clergy and laymen was called for October 4-6, 1958, at Ohrid, the seat of an ancient Orthodox Archbishopric. The involvement of the Macedonian party and government leadership was obvious throughout the conference. Several sessions were held at a trade union rest home, and government officials were present for most of the meetings. The first speaker at the conference was Strahil Gigov, Vice-Chairman of the MPR Executive Council and

Chairman of its religious affairs commission. Gigov told the convention that "the Commission for Religious Affairs of the Executive Council has positively evaluated the decision of the steering committee in calling the national church convention." 40 A letter was also read to the convention from Dobrivoje Radosavljevic, who played an important role in Macedonia during the war and who was then serving as chairman of the Commission for Religious Affairs of the Federal Executive Council.

The conference declared the re-establishment of the Archbishopric of Ohrid and the establishment of the Macedonian Orthodox Church. Elected head of the Macedonian Church - with the title Archbishop of Ohrid and Skopje and Metropolitan of Macedonia - was Dositej, a Macedonian bishop who had served as Vicar-General to Patriarch Vikentije. Although the Macedonians had created their own church, the links with the Serbian church were not completely severed. In a move to placate Serbian opposition, the Macedonian church declared that it would "remain in canonic unity with the Serbian Orthodox Church through her head, his Holiness Patriarch of the Serbian Orthodox Church," 41 - i.e., the Serbian Patriarch would be patriarch of both the Serbian and Macedonian churches.

Although the Macedonian and Yugoslav leaderships had opposed creation of the Macedonian church for thirteen years, new conditions brought about a change of attitude. First, by 1958 the Macedonian party leadership had a firm grip on Macedonia. An independent church hierarchy would

## THE ENCOURAGEMENT OF MACEDONIAN CULTURE

pose little threat to its power or prestige. Since the party and government were instrumental in setting up the new church and would have to continue to support it for it to survive, there was little possibility that the church would be awkward to control. Second, the Serb hierarchy was temporarily immobilized by the death of Patriarch Vikentije on July 5, 1958. He had been on good terms with the government and was a strong opponent of Macedonian church autonomy. The new Patriarch, German, was chosen September 13 and was still consolidating his position within the church and with the political leadership of Yugoslavia when the Macedonian church declared its independence. It was probably more than just a coincidence that Patriarch German was first received by President Tito on the very same day that Lazar Kolisevski, head of state of the MPR, received the newly elected Archbishop Dositej. 42

Probably the most crucial element in bringing about the establishment of a separate church at this time was the Bulgarian denial of the existence of the Macedonian nationality. As relations between Yugoslavia and the Soviet Union declined before April 1958, the Bulgarian government launched a strong attack against Belgrade, publishing articles and speeches to show that Macedonians are Bulgarians. The Bulgarian campaign provoked vigorous countermeasures in Yugoslavia. and Kolisevski's speech in Titov Veles which gave a new slant to Macedonian history. Macedonian national holidays on August 2 (Ilinden) and October 11 (the anniversary of the first Macedonian partisan operations in 1941) were used as major occasions to reaffirm the Macedonian nationality. The conference to create the Macedonian church came just two weeks after Dimitur Ganev made the most anti-Yugoslav irredentist speech of any postwar Bulgarian

leader up to that time. When the existence of the Macedonian nationality was being more seriously challenged than at any previous time, 43 the creation of the Macedonian Orthodox Church was a powerful way for the Yugoslavs to reaffirm its separate existence.

The Serbian hierarchy was forced to acquiesce in the creation of the church. In 1959 a Serbian council declared that its constitution no longer applied to the dioceses and parishes of Macedonia. However, despite the reluctant formal approval, the Serbian church failed to accept the Macedonian church fully. The Macedonians complained that the Serbian church "did not fulfill her obligation to introduce the independent Macedonian church to other autocephalous Orthodox Churches." The patriarch was accused of using the title "Patriarch of Serbia" rather than his full title "Patriarch of Serbia and Macedonia." Serbian church officials on visits to Macedonia were accused of calling the area "South Serbia" and referring to the Macedonian faithful as "Serbian brothers and sisters." Apparently the crowning indignity

## **YUGOSLAV COMMUNISM - MACEDONIAN QUESTION**

to the Macedonians was the Serbian church decision of May 1966 , which prohibited a national church convention from changing the constitution of the Macedonian Orthodox Church without previous approval of the Holy Synod of the Serbian church. 44

Discontent with the Serbian hierarchy's attempts to retain control and encouraged by the purge of Aleksandar Rankovic in July 1966, the Macedonian church Synod met with the Serbian Synod on November 18, 1966, and requested autocephalous status.<sup>45</sup> The request had the full approval of the Macedonian government. Metropolitan Dositej told the churchmen:

We have agreed to seek independence from the Serbian Orthodox Church. This decision was presented to the Executive Council of Macedonia, which devoted a whole session to the question and notified us that we were not mistaken in seeking independence for our church.<sup>46</sup>

Although at the November meeting the Serbian representatives would not approve autocephalous status for the Macedonian church, a formal request was addressed to the Holy Synod of the Serbian Orthodox Church in December 1966. The request threatened that if the Synod failed to act favorably the Macedonian church would take up the problem at a National Church Convention.

The Synod did not consider the Macedonian request until the following May, but in March the Macedonian church authorities announced that a church convention would be 'held in July. Patriarch German immediately visited Petar Stambolic, the Serb who was president of the Federal Executive Council, and denounced the prospective Macedonian action as "unlawful" and "uncanonical." When the Serbian Holy Synod considered the Macedonian proposal in May, it declared that the Macedonian church had too few priests and bishops, no theological school, and had dealt with the question in violation of church canons. The request was denied. The Synod's decision concluded:

But if the Macedonian Church, contrary to the canons, declares her independence at her metropolitan National Church Convention, she will be considered both by the Serbian Orthodox Church and by other autocephalous Orthodox Churches as a dissident religious organization and as such she will be separated from them. 47

The Macedonian Church, nevertheless, held its national convention at Ohrid July 17-19, 1967, "rectified historical injustice" by declaring itself to be autocephalous, and elected Dositej as head of the church with the title Archbishop of Ohrid and Macedonia. The full support of the government was again in evidence. The chairman of the Federal Commission for

## THE ENCOURAGEMENT OF MACEDONIAN CULTURE

Religious Affairs, Milo Jovicevic (a Montenegrin), was present as were two members of the Executive Council of Macedonia and other local Macedonian officials. After the church was declared autocephalous and Dositej chosen to head it, a decree of President Tito was read to the convention -awarding Dositej the Order of the Yugoslav Banner with Sash. Following the decision telegrams were sent congratulating Dositej and the conference by Mito HadZivasilev, Chairman of the SRM Assembly, and by Krste Crvenkovski, chairman of the LCM.48

It is significant that the Macedonian church declared itself independent only after the removal of Aleksandar Rankovic and the break-up of the conservative Serb faction which he headed in the federal Yugoslav government and party bureaucracy. As a representative of Serbian interests, Rankovic undoubtedly supported the conservative Serbian hierarchy in its differences with the Macedonian clerics. Krste Crvenkovski commented on the Macedonian church in a meeting of the Macedonian Party *activ* with Tito present:

It is well known that for twenty years Rankovic had personally insisted and had done everything possible to ensure that this [church] question would not be settled in the spirit of our social and federal system and freedom. . . . Therefore it was on the other [Serbian] side that politics had been deeply involved in this question. If this had only been a religious question, it is probable that it would have been solved as long ago as 1945. . . . Certain comrades in Serbia emphasize with good reason that these [links between the Serbian and Macedonian church] were the last remnants of Greater Serbian hegemony in Macedonia. 49

The timing of the Macedonian demands for independence would support Crvenkovski's claim that Rankovic was a major obstacle. The first demand for autonomy was submitted in November 1966-Rankovic was removed from his party and government positions in July and expelled from the party in October 1966. While the purge of Rankovic removed the chief roadblock, there were also positive benefits to the Macedonian leadership to be gained from granting full independence to the church at this time. Eliminating one of the most obvious remnants of Serbian

hegemony was a useful concession to Macedonian national feeling. Granting autonomy to the church was a safety valve for national discontent at a time when unemployment and economic difficulties resulting from the economic reforms were having their most serious effect in Macedonia. By creating a fully independent national church, the political leaders hoped to uncouple national dissatisfaction from economic problems by supporting a popular issue. 50

The Serbian hierarchy did not accept the Macedonian action passively. Patriarch German visited Milka Spiljak, new Croatian president of the Fed

## **YUGOSLAV COMMUNISM - MACEDONIAN QUESTION**

eral Executive Council, to protest the action, then gathered his forces by calling upon the President of the Serbian Executive Council 51 and visiting Montenegro. The Patriarchate also published the reasons for its decision of May 1967 in refusing to grant the Macedonian church autonomy, and called a special session of the Holy Synod to consider the action of the Macedonians. The leadership of the government-sponsored Association of Orthodox Priests counseled the Synod to pass a "wise, mild and moderate decision" or the "very good relations between the Serbian church. and the state could be disturbed and even deteriorate for a long period of time." 52 The special session of the Holy Synod, however, accused the Macedonian clergy of "forming a dissident religious organization" and announced "canonical and liturgical communications with that hierarchy have been broken off and the Holy Synod of the Serbian Orthodox Church has been asked to take proceedings against the perpetrators of this breach." 5,

In Belgrade, newspaper editorials enjoined caution and understanding on both sides. In Macedonia the Serbian Synod's decision created considerable excitement. *Nova Makedonija* declared the decision an "anachronism" and published a lengthy history of the struggle of the Macedonian Church for independence. Macedonian political leaders called the decision an attempt by Serbs to retain a remnant of their hegemony over Macedonia. The Macedonian church announced that it had decided to form its own school of theology and classes began the following month. A synod of the Macedonian church rejected the Serbian decision ,but "voiced the belief that common sense would prevail and that the leaders of the Serbian Orthodox Church would in the end resume contacts with the autocephalous Macedonian Orthodox Church."54

The declaration of independence by the Macedonian church has had far reaching ramifications because of the Balkan concept of identity between church and nationality. Although the conservative Serbs were forced by law to admit the existence of the Macedonian nationality, they refused to go the last step and grant the Macedonians the right to a separate church. But they were not alone in refusing to acknowledge the Macedonian church. Patriarch German sent a letter to the Greek Orthodox Church explaining the Serbian church action against the Macedonian church hierarchy. The Greek organization denounced the Macedonians and resolved to sever all links with the Macedonian church. Athenagoras, the Ecumenical Patriarch of all Orthodox Churches, visited Belgrade in mid-October 1967 and conferred with German. The communique on their visit stated that complete agreement was reached on all church questions, which would imply Athenagoras' support of the Serbian position against the Macedonian church. The Macedonian church took

steps to improve its international standing by send

## THE ENCOURAGEMENT OF MACEDONIAN CULTURE

ing envoys to Constantinople to confer with Athenagoras and also by sending representatives to visit die patriarchs of Rumania, Bulgaria and Russia: Although the Greek Church was the only foreign Orthodox church to take a stand immediately and publicly against the Macedonian church, there are reasons for the other churches failing to recogpize the. Macedonian church. The Orthodox churches of Greece and Bulgaria would have political problems if they were to recognize the Skopje archbishopric because the government of neither country acknowledges the existence of a Macedonian nationality. Recognition of the Macedonian church would put the Russian Orthodox Church in an awkward position vis-a-vis its Ukrainian faithful who also would like to be recognized as an independent church.

Party assistance in bringing about the full autonomy of the Macedonian church hardly represents a change in party policy towards religion. The party ideology is still atheistic; party leaders officially denounc\_ the effects of religion, oppose religious instruction for children, and take administrative measures to limit the church's influence and ability to carry out its respon sibilities. However, the party also recognized the significance of religion as a means of affirming national existence and stimulating national consciousness. Hence, the Macedonian Communists used the church, wh0se existence they are seeking to undermine, to' affirm a policy they are trying to carry out. By supporting the church's independence the Macedonian party and government leaders were also able to secure support and cooperation of the clergy and reduce the hostility of the faithful. While the Orthodox Macedonians may not appear to be very pious, the church touches the conscious\_ness of most Macedonians. The creation of a fully independent Macedonian church, while long delayed and accomplished piecemeal for political purposes, may well be one of the most significant aspects of the new Macedonian culture.

Because of the Bulgarian consciousness of a large part of the Mace donian population, culture in Macedonia has been allowed somewhat greater latitude than in other republics of Yugoslavia. The cultural field has also i contributed more to the development of a Macedonian national conscious . ness than any other area. After twenty-five years the major questions of Macedonian culture have been resolved. The Macedonian literary language has achieved a standard form generally accepted by the Macedonian popu .lation; the premises and outline of the Macedonian national interpretation of history have been worked out (although detail is yet to be supplied in many areas); the Macedonian Orthodox Church has been established fully independent of the Serbian church; graphic and performing arts have utilized nationalistic themes, though their direct contribution to Macedonian con

## YUGOSLAV COMMUNISM - MACEDON IAN QUESTION

sciousness has been more limited. The ability of the Macedonian Communists to withstand the very vigorous Bulgarian challenges to the Macedonian national existence since 1958 indicates the success of the new cultural forms. But the

serious concern evident in both Skopje and Belgrade whenever Bulgarian scholars criticize the Macedonian language, history or culture indicates that the new culture has not been completely successful in eradicating Bulgarian consciousness.

## CONCLUSION

The crucial element of the CPY policy on Macedonia was its decision to recognize the existence of a Macedonian nationality. But did it adopt this policy because such a nationality really existed, or because it was a useful tactic at the time? An answer to this question requires documents from archives and accounts from participants which are not now available and will likely never be available. There were ample political reasons for the CPY decision to declare the existence of a Macedonian nationality whether one existed or not. During the Second World War, there were pressing reasons for implementing this policy. The political goals of the CPY in Macedonia were furthered by recognizing a separate nationality.

First, it was crucial for the CPY to gain control of the area. After the Axis occupation of Yugoslavia and the commencement of the partisan struggle, the Macedonian policy was implemented because the CPY was unable without it to gain control of the Vardar region. Recognition of a separate Macedonian nationality was a crucial element in the success of the CPY in Macedonia during the Second World War.

Second, the policy was useful to justify the retention of Vardar Macedonia within the Yugoslav federation. An area inhabited by a population seventy percent of which was Bulgarian should justifiably belong to Bulgaria. Since the inhabitants of Macedonia strongly opposed being called Serbs, it was not possible after the war to use this method of legalizing their retention as a part of Yugoslavia. However, a non-Bulgarian, non-Serbian population of Slavs could belong to a federation of Slavic peoples as one of the fraternal nations. The decisions of the Jacje Conference carried out this policy by granting Macedonia the status of a national republic and placing it on the same level as Serbia, Croatia, Slovenia and Montenegro.

A third reason for recognizing the Macedonian nationality was to eliminate the Bulgarian consciousness of the vast majority of Vardar Macedonians. Thus, the party has not only recognized the nationality, but also has taken and still undertakes vigorous steps to encourage its culture to differentiate Macedonian from Bulgarian. Republican political and economic "autonomy," the Macedonian language, reinterpretation of history, the Macedonian church, and all other attributes of a distinct nationality have played a major role in de-Bulgarizing the Macedonian population.

The editorial board of [WWW.Makedonskatribuna.com](http://WWW.Makedonskatribuna.com) does not have the permission to publish parts of this book. We ask the editors of the Yugoslav communist party and the Macedonian question for understanding.

The fourth aim of the CPY's policy was to extend Yugoslav hegemony to all of Macedonia. Here, as we have seen, the Yugoslav Communists met failure, not because of their policy but because of external factors over which the Yugoslavs had little control. Although the expansionist corollary of the Yugoslav policy continues to disturb relations with Bulgaria and Greece, its lack of success thus far has not been considered necessarily permanent by any of the states involved in the Macedonian question.

These political reasons in and of themselves justified to the CPY its stand on the Macedonian question. The evidence of timing and the way concessions were granted to Macedonian nationalism - for example, the circumstances around the founding of the Macedonian Orthodox Church in 1958 - indicate that the party has manipulated its policy on the Macedonian question to accomplish its political goals.

However, merely acknowledging that the party adopted an expedient and largely efficacious policy on the Macedonian question does not determine if, in fact, a Macedonian nationality exists. Before World War II there is little doubt that the vast majority of the Slavo-Macedonians considered themselves to be Bulgarian. Even after the disillusionment produced by the Bulgarian occupation during World War II, most Macedonians either still considered themselves Bulgarians or could have been led to consider themselves as such with little difficulty. This is not to deny that there were differences between the Bulgarians and the Yugoslav Macedonians. Some differences, of course, did exist even before the partition of Macedonia in 1913. These differences had grown in Vardar Macedonia under a quarter century of Serbian rule. But it is doubtful that the Macedonians in either Yugoslavia or Greece were sufficiently different that they considered themselves to be a nationality separate from the Bulgarians.

Whether a Macedonian nationality exists today in Vardar Macedonia is a far more complex question. No Macedonian in Yugoslavia would admit openly that he considers himself Bulgarian-it is neither wise nor safe to do so. Macedonian nationalism has been encouraged by the Yugoslav Communists for over twenty-five years, and this surely has had some impact on the consciousness of the Macedonians. The extent to which Communist-supervised Macedonian nationalism has enlarged Macedonian national consciousness varies more according to age groups than to social strata, although there appear to be significant differences in the degree of acceptance. For instance, the peasants have been less responsive than the intelligentsia in accepting the party's Macedonian policy. The present adult generation's mode of thinking and feeling about Macedonia was shaped by a milieu radically different from that in which the younger generation is being raised. Among the adults there are many who find the realities of Yugoslav Macedonia to be far from their dreams. This is particularly true in the case of the age group which experienced the worst period of Serbian terror, shortly before and after World War I. They would be wary of any kind of Belgrade-directed government. The dissatisfaction with the forms of autonomy and their centralist content seems to increase in direct proportion to age. Among those whose memories go back only to the late twenties or thirties, the communist efforts seem to have made more progress. Undoubtedly some antigovernment sentiment is transmitted to children and youth by their parents, but the Communists with their control over communication media and education have formidable weapons in the struggle for the next adult generation.

Yugoslav Communist policy on Macedonia is at least passively accepted by the

population of the SRM. Widespread active resistance and hostility to Belgrade-which was the rule during the interwar period-has been the exception in postwar Macedonia. Although part of the explanation lies in the greater efficiency of the Communists to pinpoint and eliminate opposition, the Macedonian policy has been instrumental in reducing the discontent. There is no alternative to Tito's Yugoslavia. Rule by Athens is desired by virtually none. Macedonians have become disenchanted with Bulgaria, despite occasional irredentist outbursts, because of its Stalinist internal policy and its subservience to Moscow. An autonomous Macedonia is strongly opposed by Greece, Bulgaria, and Yugoslavia. For Bulgarians, being Macedonian is a good second best to being Bulgarian. They are not being Serbianized, they can use their own almost-Bulgarian language, they are somewhat independent in running their own affairs. The concept of a separate nationality has secured the acquiescence if not the enthusiastic acceptance of the Macedonians.

With its future linked with the Yugoslav federation, much of the further development of the Macedonian question will depend on the evolution of the Yugoslav nationalities. Party officials maintain that the federal system has "solved" the Yugoslav national question, and some even talk of the future merging of nationalities into a common "Yugoslav" culture. Although the communist theoretical position on the national question postulates the merging of nationalities, the Yugoslavs have extended their revisionism into the sphere of national theory as well as to economics and politics. Lazar Kolarov was one of the vocal advocates of the continuation of separate nationalities. He criticized Stalin for failing to see that the essence of the national question has changed, because the working class in a socialist system, by developing socialist social relations, must of necessity become the champion of positive national interests and national progress.<sup>2</sup> Other-particularly non-Serb- Yugoslav communist leaders have declared

their opposition to the concept of merging nations. Mika Tripalo, a Croatian Communist leader, told a gathering of the Macedonian party *activ*:

Comrades, it is perfectly clear to all of us that Yugoslavism as a nationality does not exist, because all of this is based on the illusion that under conditions of socialist development. . . life will develop in the direction of small nations growing into great nations, and that thus also a general Yugoslav nation will grow out of the individual nations in Yugoslavia. This is an illusion, that is quite clear, and we are of course opposing such views. 'I

Although the Macedonian nationality has been acknowledged by the Yugoslav Communists and the right of the Yugoslav nations to continue as separate nationalities has been acknowledged, the Macedonian question is far from settled.

Within Yugoslavia, the Macedonian question remains a potential source of difficulty. Macedonian nationalism is much newer, hence more volatile than the older nationalisms. As the trend for republican party and government autonomy increases, Macedonia may well play a key role in the Yugoslav federation. With Serbs and Croats traditionally hostile and on opposite sides on most major issues, Macedonia may become a crucial balancing factor with greater significance than its numbers or position would warrant. Though Macedonians are traditionally anti-Serb and are certain to oppose any Serbian attempts to re-establish hegemony in Macedonia, this will not prevent Macedonia from aligning with Serbia if its interests require it. There was a strong movement in Macedonia to align with the Serb bureaucracy in opposition to economic reform. The economically under-developed, religiously Orthodox, and culturally Byzantine Macedonians have much in common with Serbs and Montenegrins. The effect of Macedonian national aspirations on the decisions of the SRM will be a key factor in the future course of Yugoslavia.

Although armed hostilities over Macedonia have almost ceased since 1949, the Macedonian question is far from settled in the international sphere. The frequent Bulgarian-Yugoslav polemics and the negative effect on Greek-Yugoslav relations attest to the continued significance of Macedonia. However, the Yugoslav Communist recognition of a Macedonian nationality has transformed the character of the question. In Yugoslavia the Macedonian population is not actively opposing its situation; there is little discontent for Bulgaria to exploit. The unattractiveness of the Sofia regime and its links with the Soviet Union limit the Bulgarian appeal. At the same time the Yugoslav policy has given Belgrade the opportunity and means to advocate Macedonian unification. Yugoslavia—possessing the largest Slavo-Macedonian population, advocating recognition of Macedonian cultural rights by Greece and Bulgaria, and following its own course independent of the Soviet Union and the United States—has become credible as the power most likely to unite Macedonia. Although world conditions do not permit a change in Balkan boundaries, the Yugoslav Communist policy on Macedonia has at present given the Yugoslavs the initiative.

However, the Balkans are not noted for stability. Although at present the Yugoslavs do have the initiative, it might pass to others. The Yugoslav federation will face its most serious internal challenge since the Second World War when aging Marshal Tito dies. Any significant post-Tito instability would likely focus Yugoslav energies on its internal problems and the Macedonian Question would become less

important to Belgrade. At the same time, Bulgaria could develop into a more attractive alternative than it now is. The attempted *coup d'état* of April 1965 and the Zhivkov-inspired campaign to foster Bulgarian patriotism and emphasize national history indicate the strength of Bulgarian nationalism. Sharing no frontier with the Soviet Union and separated from the USSR by an increasingly independent Rumania, Bulgaria has the potential to achieve much greater independence vis-a-vis Moscow. Any move for independence from the Soviet Union or the coming to power of a more nationalist regime in Sofia would make Bulgaria a much more attractive alternative. Although Yugoslav Communist policy has been the key to the Macedonian Question for over twenty-five years, the future may produce a different situation. Within Yugoslavia, Macedonian nationalism is probably acquiring a dynamic of its own and this injects still another element of uncertainty into the Balkan equation. Without doubt, Macedonia will continue to be a complex focal point of conflict in Balkan politics and a crucial factor in Yugoslav internal affairs.